



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/193,833	11/17/98	GAINEY	003838.P001

TM31/1106
STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI, LLP
P.O. BOX 51860
PALO ALTO CA 94303-0728

EXAMINER

LE, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 11/06/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/193,833

Applicant(s)

Galney

Examiner

Debbie M Le

Group Art Unit

2177



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 17, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reed et al (US Patent 5,862,325)..

3. As to claim 1, Reed discloses a communication system comprising:

receiving a message in an enterprise mail system, said a message from a message sender (col. 6, lines 49-67).

categorizing said message by selecting a first category entry from a category database (messages are defined by types [fig. 3, # 144, col. 5, lines 41-50, col. 17, lines 55-67, col. 18, lines 1-25, col. 26, lines 22-27]);

creating a response message using said first category entry, said response message including a response body defined in said first category entry and a set of recipients defined in said first category entry (fig. 3, # 120, fig. 25, # 1121, col. 5, lines 24-30, col. 17, lines 39-42, col. 22, lines 29-67, col. 23, lines 1-10, col. 27, lines 53-60, col. 31, lines 16-34).

4. As to claim 4, Reed discloses a communication system comprising:

Art Unit:

receiving a first message in an enterprise mail system, said a first message from a first message sender (col. 6, lines 49-67).

storing said first message in a message database (fig. 8, # 31, col. 5, lines 4-8, col. 16, lines 55-67);

assigning a category entry from a category database (Col. 21, lines 63-67, col. 22, lines 1-27);

delivering said first message to a first enterprise mail system user, said enterprise mail system user creating a template response message with said category (col. 22, lines 29-67, col. 27, lines 24-60).

5. As to claim 5, Reed discloses assigning a category entry from a category database is performed by a rule processor (fig. 3, # 130, 140, col. 17, lines 43-53, col. 21, lines 33-62, col. 74, lines 33-43).

6. As to claim 6, Reed discloses assigning a category entry from a category database is performed by said enterprise mail system user (col. 27, 62-67, col. 28, lines 1-48, col. 74, lines 43-65).

7. As to claim 7, Reed discloses a set of default message body sections for said response message (fig. 26 & 27, col. 73, lines 58-67, col. 74, lines 1-32).

8.

Art Unit:

9. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 2, 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed et al, (U.S Patent 5,862,325) as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Gormley et al (U.S Patent 5,806,057).

12. As to claim 2, Reed does not explicitly teach recipient comprises a carbon copy recipient. However, Gormley 's invention discloses the computer is programmed to automatically generate lists of carbon copy recipients (fig. 8, 17, 19, 25, 24b, 29, 33a, # 501, col. 2, lines 9-12, col. 15, lines 30-38, col. 18, lines 1-67, col. 19, lines 1-11). It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit:

ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to utilize a carbon copy in an e-mail system in order to provide better communication among users in a network.

13. As to claims 8-11, Reed does not explicitly teach one set of default message body sections comprising: a salutation, a body header, a closing, and a footer. However, Gormley's does teach those features (fig. 8, 17, 19, 25, 24b, 28, 33, # 486, 467, 34a, col. 16, lines 64-65, col. 17, lines 56-67, col. 25& 26). One of ordinary skill in the art is motivated to modify Reed according to Gormley to generate a response with a predefined form in order to speed up the response time.

14. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed et al, (U.S Patent 5,862,325), as to applied to claim 1, and further in view of Linstead et al (U.S Patent 5,548,753).

15. As to claim 3, Reed and Gormley do not explicitly teach recipient comprises a blind carbon copy recipient. However, Linstead's invention discloses a blind carbon copy recipient in the e-mail system (col. 2, lines 25-36, col. 3, lines 31-35, col. 7, lines 51-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to utilize a blind carbon copy in an e-mail system in order to provide better communication among users in a network.

Art Unit:

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Zellweger, U.S # 6,131,098: method and apparatus for a database management system content menu.

Shaw, WO 00/29988: method and apparatus for performing enterprise E-mail management.

Gormley et al, U.S # 5,628,004: system for managing database of communication of recipients.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Debbie M. Le** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-6409**.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John Breene**, can be reach on **(703) 305-9790**. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-5357.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Oct. 27, 00



Debbie Le



JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100